



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/642,771	08/22/2000	Toru Hisamitsu	501.38779X00	1339
20457	7590	02/04/2004	EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 1800 ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889			PARDO, THUY N	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2175		
DATE MAILED: 02/04/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/642,771	HISAMITSU ET AL.
	Examiner Thuy Pardo	Art Unit 2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sato et al. (Hereinafter “Sato”) US Patent No. 6,212,517.

As to claim 1, Sato teaches the invention substantially as claimed, comprising:

A word importance calculation method for calculating the importance of words contained in a document set, whereby the difference between the word distribution in a subset of whole documents which consists of every document containing a specified word and the word distribution in the set of whole documents is used to calculate the importance of the word [ab; fig. 7-13; col. 1, lines 53-61].

As to claim 2, Sato teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Sato further teaches that said difference is determined by comparing the distance d between said subset and said set of whole documents with the distance d', or the estimated value of d', between another subset of documents which contain substantially the same number of words as said subset of documents and are randomly selected from said set of whole documents, and said set of whole documents [col. 10, lines 50 to col. 11, lines 4].

As to claim 3, Sato teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Sato further teaches the distance d between the two document sets is calculated by using the word distribution in each document set, that is to say using the probability of occurrence of each word in each of said document set [col. 6, lines 59 to col. 7, lines 20 and lines 53 to col. 8, lines 65].

As to claim 4, Sato teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Sato further teaches that if the number of documents containing said word is larger than a prescribed number, a preset number of documents are extracted from the said subset of whole documents by random sampling, and the difference between the extracted set of documents and said set of whole

documents is used instead of the difference between the original subset of documents and the set of whole documents [ab; fig. 8-9, 12].

As to claim 5, Sato teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Sato further teaches that the importance is brought to bear on the selection, arrangement or coloring of the words displayed on the screen [fig. 8].

As to claims 6 and 7, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As to claim 8, Sato teaches the invention substantially as claimed whereby:
a characteristic quantity of a document set containing a certain word [fig. 8];
a characteristic quantity of a randomly extracted document set of the size of said set are compared [col. 12, lines 13-29; fig. 8]; and
the importance of said word is thereby calculated ab; fig. 11].

As to claim 9, Sato teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Sato further teaches the difference between the word distribution in said document set and the word distribution in the set of all documents is used as said characteristic quantity [fig. 8-13; col. 9, lines 5 to col. 10, lines 63].

Art Unit: 2175

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Pardo, whose telephone number is (703) 305-1091. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows: (703) 872-9306 (Official Communication)

and/or:

(703) 746-5616 (*Use this Fax#, only after approval by Examiner, for “INFORMAL” or “Draft” communication. Examiner may request that a formal/amendment be faxed directly to then on occasions.*)

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

4. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-5359, (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal
Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



Thuy Pardo
January 29, 2004